UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,385	10/19/2005	Takahiro Nagai	074782-0023	1179
Michael E. Fog	7590 05/14/201 ¹ arty, Esq.	EXAMINER		
McDERMOTT	WILL & EMERY LLI	MEANS, JAREN M		
600 13th Street, Washington, DO		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2447	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/14/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/553,385	NAGAI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Jaren M. Means	2447					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>27 April 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appel for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, by (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	**	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for				
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a o	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	. 0						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).				
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a				
10. 🔲 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been consideration because: See Continuation Sheet	ered but does NOT place the applic	eation in condition for a	allowance				
See Continuation Sheet. 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	PTO/SR/08) Paper No/s)						
13. Other:	1 10/00/00/1 apel 140(s).						
/Joon H. Hwang/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2447							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

I.Applicants argue on page 2 of the remarks that, Goodman does not disclose sending the network address of one client (second terminal device) to the other client (first terminal device) when the first terminal device retains the multimedia information, or sending the network address of the first terminal device to the second terminal device when the second terminal device retains the multimedia information. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments because Goodman's seed list contains several network addresses including a second terminal device and the first terminal device both when the first terminal device retains the multimedia information and when the second terminal device retains the multimedia information. Therefore, since the all addresses in either case, using the broadest reasonable interpretation Goodman discloses the claimed limitation.

II.Applicants argue on page 2 of the remarks that, Goodman does not disclose the processes being performed on the server. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments because Goodman discloses that the servers can maintain multiple indexes and allow access to different forms of data. This type of system would use software agents or Bots to provide services such as extraction and consolidation of multiple resources, chat facilities, and notifications of changes. Search requests could be stored in the server and set to run in real-time or as a batch process, and alert the appropriate clients of the results (section 13). Therefore, Goodman discloses the instant application's claimed limitation.